

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 7, 2006. Claims 1, 3 to 19, 23, 25 to 41 and 45 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 23 and 45, all of which are independent, have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 10 to 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,249 (Namba); and Claims 3 to 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Namba in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,767 (Jackson). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns an information processing apparatus. An operation status of a program executed in the apparatus is acquired. A status concept instance is generated that represents the acquired operation status of the program. Different types of information are input by a plurality of input units. The input information is stored with an input time thereof in a storage unit (or means). At least two types of information stored in the storage unit (or means) are sorted in an order of the input time. An input concept instance is generated from a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted in the input time order, by referring to a rule stored in a knowledge base, which stores a rule for defining information necessary for generating the input concept instance with respect to a type of input concept. The status concept instance and the input concept instance are unified.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claims 1, 23 and 45 are respectively directed to an apparatus, a method and a computer-readable storage medium.

Thus, among its many features, the present invention provides for (i) generating a status concept instance that represents an acquired operation status of a program, (ii) generating an input concept instance from a sequence of at least two types of information sorted in input time order, by referring to a rule stored in a knowledge base, which stores a rule for defining information necessary for generating the input concept instance with respect to a type of input concept, and (iii) unifying the status concept instance and the input concept instance.

The applied references of Namba and Jackson are not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

As understood by Applicants, Namba discloses an input device including a unit for recognizing an input time of input information accepted via each of the plural inputting means, a unit for dividing or merging the input information into a predetermined primitive analysis unit, to obtain a recognition result. The input device also includes a unit for estimating the input time of a unit recognition result, by using an estimating method predetermined for each of the inputting units, and a unit for collecting some of the recognition results whose estimated input times are close to one another, and outputting the collected information as a semantic analysis unit. See Namba column 2, lines 10 to 32; column6, lines 51 to 58; and column16 line 51 to column17, line 8.

However, Namba is not seen to disclose or suggest generating a status concept instance that represents an acquired operation status of a program. In addition, Namba is not seen to disclose or suggest generating an input concept instance from a sequence of at least two types of information sorted in input time order, by referring to a rule stored in a knowledge base, which stores a rule for defining information necessary for

generating the input concept instance with respect to a type of input concept. Moreover, Namba is not seen to disclose or suggest unifying the status concept instance and the input concept instance.

In addition, Jackson has been reviewed and is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Namba. In particular, although column 3, lines 4 to 58 and Figure 3 of Jackson may be seen to disclose an example sentence 260 and a corresponding interpretation 270 which might be generated by a run-time interpreter 250 according to a user specification of semantics, nothing in Jackson is seen to disclose or suggest the foregoing features (i) to (iii).


Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 23 and 45 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 125690v1